

(SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

at Belgaum are secured on hire-purchase basis by calling for tenders;

(b) whether it is a fact that during the current financial year instead of getting the she-sheep through a tenderer, some of the officers of the Institute go to the market and secure the sheep on cash basis;

(c) whether they are aware that such departure from the normal practice is likely to give rise to corrupt practice?

A.—SRI K. K. HEGDE (Minister for Health).—

(a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE RULES OF PROCEDURE.

Motion to consider.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—Sir, I move:

“That the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly as reported by the Special Committee on the Rules of Procedure be taken into consideration.”

MR. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

“That the Report of the Special Committee on the Rules of Procedure be taken into consideration.”

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—In this connection, I would like to submit a few words. The Rules that are now in force are the rules that were in force prior to 1st November 1956 with modifications and adaptations from time to time made by the Speaker. With a view to draft new rules, the Hon'ble Speaker was pleased to set up a Committee. That Committee went into the question and submitted its Report with the draft rules the year in the month of March, 1957. The House could not consider the Report because, some time thereafter, the House had to be dissolved in view of the

general elections. The matter was considered in the month of October last and the House appointed a Special Committee to go into the question. The Special Committee considered the rules and have submitted this Report for the consideration of this House along with the rules. The rules that we have submitted for the consideration of this House are mostly modelled on the Lok Sabha Rules. Some departure has been made in the case of the procedure which is to govern questions. As the Hon'ble Members are aware, at present they are entitled to send as many questions as they please whether starred or unstarred. The questions do not lapse. They are carried over from day to day and from session to session, and therefore the Government finds it difficult to answer promptly all the questions tabled by the Hon'ble Members. Sometimes answers are furnished six months after the questions are tabled. By that time, the importance of the question will have been lost. Therefore, with a view to obviate this difficulty, we have proposed that each member should have the right to table only ten starred questions and that the Government should be compelled to answer them generally within 15 days and in exceptional circumstances, within one month. There is no limit so far as unstarred questions are concerned. They can send any number of unstarred questions. Government is bound to reply to them. This procedure will give more rights to the Members and they will be able to table questions of general importance and elicit information at least within a fortnight or within a month.

With regard to resolutions we have made certain modifications with a view to enable the members to send resolutions until the last day meant for the discussion of resolutions instead of drawing the lot for the whole session. Under the new rules, lots will be drawn for each day on which discussion has to take place.

These are the most important changes which the Committee has effected. In other respects we have followed the procedure that is in vogue in the Lok Sabha.

The Hon'ble Members have in their possession the Report that we have submitted to the House. It is needless for me to go into the question in detail. I am sure the simplified rules will help the Hon'ble members to dispose of more questions under the new rules. I commend the Report of this Committee for the acceptance of this august House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like to inform the House that today there will be only general discussion and tomorrow amendments will be taken up.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangu).—We are indeed grateful to the Hon'ble Speaker for setting up a Committee to go into the question of revising the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the House. Surely, it must have been within the knowledge of the Speaker as to the inconvenience caused to the members of this House in regard to the existing procedure. I must admit that the new Rules of Procedure which are brought out in the Special Report are certainly an improvement on the existing Rules of Procedure. But, on one or two matters I wish to bring to the notice of the House that it would have been better if the rules were further amended or modified.

First, coming to Questions, in any democracy, the right of interpellating is one of the most valuable privileges of the members of the House and on the extent to which questions are answered promptly, clearly and correctly, depends the success or failure of democracy. Having this in view I do not know why the Committee which more or less copied the provisions of the Lok Sabha rules failed to copy also the particular chapter relating to questions. I wish the Hon'ble Minister who moved for adoption of this Report, had mentioned the special circumstances which made them not to adopt the procedure prescribed in the Lok Sabha relating to questions.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I have mentioned the number of difficulties we have been put to.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The point that I wish to make clear is that the Lok Sabha Rules have been evolved

as the result of a long experience, and as a process of trial and error and I personally feel that it would be a distinct improvement on the present rules if the chapter relating to questions in the Lok Sabha Rules of Procedure is copied *in toto*. I would like to be enlightened of the special difficulties that exist.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like to say one thing here. We have copied the Lok Sabha Rules with a little bit of adaptation because in Punjab the rules of Lok Sabha could not work satisfactorily. That is why we have copied from the Punjab rules. In the first instance the Government will have to answer within 15 days. In very exceptional cases one month's time will be given and that also after taking the necessary permission.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Even in regard to the order in which these questions are asked, supposing I ask ten questions, I will be at a loss to know on what particular day they will be taken up. It would be better if we know when they will be taken up.

Coming to the arrangement of Government business and non-official business, I personally feel that the procedure adopted by the Lok Sabha in regard to non-official business is a wholesome one and deserves to be adopted. Supposing a session lasts for 30 days, the non-official business is relegated to the background. I must say this without any fear of contradiction. It is not given that much of importance as it deserves. Whether it is official or non-official business it is for the House to decide its importance. I do not know why step-motherly treatment should be shown to the members in the matter of non-official business. We all know that the Hon'ble Speaker will guard the interests of the non-officials. But, my fear is, even according to the existing rules, non-official business has not received sufficient importance.

Then, Sir, in regard to introduction of Bills, it is better that hereafter a weekly programme is fixed well in advance and members are informed of it in time because it is not at all possible to study them under the existing arrange-

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

ment. At present we will be informed just the previous evening what exactly are the Bills that would be taken up the next day. It is difficult for the members to find time to study them. So, what I say is, when you fix up the Government business you must draw up a programme so that the members may know what are the Bills that will be taken up and their order.

In regard to answering questions, it is much better if we know who is the Minister that will answer and who are the ministers whose questions will be taken up on a particular day so that we may not bother the other ministers. Even from the members, point of view, it is better if they know beforehand because they can adjust other business. Many a time what happens is, we expect that some questions will be taken up on a particular day but it would not be so. So, it is better that there is more definiteness in regard to consideration of Bills, and in regard to questions, I am rather particular that we should adopt the Lok Sabha practice.

So far as adjournment motions are concerned, I think the Government is labouring under a misapprehension that every adjournment motion is intended as a motion of censure against Government.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—We have no such notions.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am very happy to be assured like that. But, without meaning any reflection on the Chair, it is a matter of common knowledge that latterly no adjournment motion is being accepted, for some reason or other. I want the Government and the Hon'ble Speaker to allow more adjournment motions and to show a little more latitude.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You can argue that some adjournment motions should be discussed.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I stand corrected, Sir. There is an impression gaining ground that whenever an adjournment motion is tabled, it is ruled out, it is not admitted and no scope is given for discussion. In a democracy, we act on mutual trust and supposing we want to bring a few impor-

tant matters to the notice of the Government, should we not have opportunity?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಎಲ್ಲಕ್ಕೂ ಅದ್ವೈತ್ಯ ಮೆಂಟ್ ತಂದರೆ ಕೆಲವು ಮಹತ್ವದ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದರೆ ಪರವಾಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಎದ್ದು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಬರುವುದರೊಳಗೆ ಎರಡು ಅದ್ವೈತ್ಯ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಗಳೆಂದು ಬಂದರೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯಾ.—ಅದು ತಪ್ಪು, ಅದು ತಪ್ಪು. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖಂಡಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಯಾವುದು ಮಹತ್ವದ ವಿಷಯವೋ, ಇಡೀ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ, ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸತಕ್ಕದಾಗಿದ್ದು ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರತಕ್ಕದ್ದಾಗಿದೆಯೋ, ಅದರಿಂದಾಗಿ ಪರಿಹಾರ ದೊರೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆಯೋ ಅಂಥದಕ್ಕೆ ಅದ್ವೈತ್ಯ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ, ಈಗಿನ ವಿಧಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥದಕ್ಕೂ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದು ಅನುಭವವಾಗಿದೆವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಕೊಡಿ ; ಯಾವುದು ಅಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದು ತಿರಸ್ಕೃತವಾಗಿದೆ ಹೇಳಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಕೆಲವು ವೇಳೆ Law and orderಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂಥದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದು ? ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, ಈ ಪೊಸ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ ಅವಕಾಶಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು.

I want to invite the attention of the Hon'ble Minister to the proviso to Rule 46 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the Lok Sabha.

“Provided that a question not reached for oral answer may be answered after the end of the question hour with the permission of the Speaker if the Minister represents to the Speaker that the question is one of special public interest to which he desires to give a reply.”

The Hon'ble Ministers at the Centre do not stand on formality. If they think that it is a matter of public interest, even after the question hour is over, they can make a request to the Speaker. The way in which the Lok Sabha has evolved the Rules of Procedure based on experience and how they take the House into its confidence is clear by such provisions. You must also take the Members of the Opposition into your confidence and not merely frame rules on the strength of your majority.

In regard to Short Notice Questions, I would request you to kindly see sub-

rule (3) of Rule 54 of the Lok Sabha. It reads :

"If the Minister is unable to answer the question at short notice and the Speaker is of opinion that the question is of sufficient public importance to be orally answered in the House, he may direct that the question be placed as the first question on the list of questions for the day on which it would be due for answer under rule 33."

If the Hon'ble Minister is unable to answer a question, according to the Lok Sabha practice, the Speaker can put it down as the one question claiming priority in the list of questions to be answered orally. When such liberal provisions are there in the Lok Sabha Rules, I would request the Hon'ble Minister to consider the feasibility of accepting them in our Rules also relating to questions.

There is another very important proviso to sub-rule (4) of the same rule. It is as follows :—

"Provided further in the case of a consolidated question the names of all the members concerned may be bracketed and shown against the question in the order of priority of their notice."

Supposing there are a number of Short Notice Questions tabled by a number of members and one of them happens to be absent. The Lok Sabha practice is that all those Short Notice Questions on the same subject can be consolidated in the names of all those members and in the absence of one or two of them, the member present can put the Short Notice Questions. These are some of the aspects in which the Lok Sabha practice is a very wholesome practice and we must copy some of them.

In regard to the question of giving notice for Adjournment Motion, I do not know why you want us to give copies of the motion to the Speaker, to the Minister concerned and to the Secretary. I do not know what has prevailed upon them to trouble us to get three copies. It is not as if every one of us has got a typewriter.

Further, it is a very elaborate procedure. Usually, we give one copy to the Secretary of the Legislature and it is his business to give a copy to the Speaker and to the Minister concerned. I think it is much better we revert to the old system of having only one copy sent to the Secretary.

In regard to the moving of No-confidence Motions, I think it is better to keep the number to a minimum. Now, you have increased it under the Rules. Even if one section of the House has a feeling that you do not deserve our confidence, you must try to vindicate your position. Why do you want to increase the number to 30 or 40? You must understand the real *bona fides* of this proposition. Even in respect of the Speaker, I have suggested that it should be brought down to 30. When it is difficult to form even a recognised Opposition in the absence of clearly balanced parties in the Legislature, why do you want to increase it to 40? Possibly, you want us to go abegging.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY (Bangalore south).—Possibly, you want the present strength of the Opposition to be fixed as the number.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is a very wholesome practice to see that even if a very minor and insignificant section of this House has something to say by way of censuring you, you must give an opportunity. There are 58 people in the Opposition and it is not very difficult to mobilise 30 or 40 people to give a No-confidence Motion. My point is, the lower the minimum prescribed, the better. If you really enjoy the confidence of the House, why do you want to fight shy of such a motion? It leads us to the impression that you are rather touchy and afraid and so you want to increase the number. I do not want you to give that kind of impression. These are some of the general observations which I wished to make.

I am very keen that you must consider the desirability of accepting *in toto* the provisions made in the Lok Sabha Rules in regard to questions.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—What have to you to say with regard to the difficulties I explained in brief?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Supposing I say that on a particular day, say, 28th November, I want my question to be answered. The Rules provide for the Speaker being informed by the Minister concerned of his special difficulty in not being able to provide the necessary answer. I myself will give you time. In the interest of Government it is better that they insist on their officers keeping to a time schedule. If you extend the time I am afraid you are going to help them to be a little more lazy. I consider that the power to interpellate and to table questions is a very valuable privilege of a member in a democracy. That will determine the extent to which democracy succeeds or fails.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not been able to understand you. After all, the Government has to answer within 15 days.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I say that you must prescribe a time limit even for a member to know exactly on what date you are going to answer his question. Suppose I table a question today and I want it to be answered on the 24th. If it is an inconvenient question, they will purposely put it off. My point is that it is not the Government that should decide on what day a question should be asked, but it is the member's privilege that it should be answered on a particular date. If that privilege is not going to be extended to the member, what is the use of all these Rules? When the Lok Sabha has incorporated such a rule in their Rules, why should we not adopt it? This Government will have the same type of difficulty which the Central Government is having in regard to this matter. What is the peculiarity of the Mysore Government that they cannot keep to the time scheduled?

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—Supposing a large number of members want that their question should be considered on a particular day, what is to be done?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The order in which the request is made

determines whose question will be taken up first. You seem to forget the fact that every member is expected to sacrifice a little. If a member does not give his question at the proper time he has to be in the queue and take his chance.

2-30 P.M.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—Then there is no point in incorporating that rule here at all.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY (Coondapur).—Sir, I wish to say only a very few words with regard to Chapters XVII and XVIII in support of my friend Sri Mallaradhy. Of course there seems to be some misunderstanding with regard to the position. One of my friends from the other side said that because we on this side are at a disadvantage we wanted to lower the figure regarding the number of persons necessary to move a no-confidence motion. It is incorrect.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to bring to your notice one thing. I remember you were a member of the Special Committee and have signed the Report. There is no dissenting note at all.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—I want to bring to the notice of this House certain facts.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—Contrary to the Report?

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Not contrary.

Sri J. P. SARWESH (Serum).—I rise to a point of order. Can a member sleep in the House? *(Laughter)*

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have given a ruling on that long back. A member can sleep but cannot snore here. *(Laughter)*

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Gubbi).—I also rise to a point of order. This Report is presented by the Chairman of the Special Committee. The Speaker presided over it. Therefore it is rather most embarrassing for the members to criticise the Speaker when he is in the Chair. Therefore I request the Chair to at least allow somebody to be in the Chair because it will be embarrassing for the Chair and also to me.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is the mistake that the member is making. He should not criticise the Speaker but the Report if he has anything to say on it. If he wants to criticise the Chair he will be committing a contempt of the Chair and of the House.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—My apprehension is that while discussing the Report we may have to say that the Speaker has done this or that. We cannot say. Just now you gave protection to a member that it was a slip of the tongue. Let not my friends catch hold of me and say that I have committed something and therefore the Chair should take some action. It is therefore better to allow a Chairmen from the Panel of Chairmen to be in the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not done anywhere. I have experience of the procedure in Bombay as well. I was a member of the Committee and Sri Kunte who was the Speaker was the Chairman of the Committee. When the discussion took place both of us were in the House and Sri Kunte, the Chairman, was in the Chair. After all there is nothing to hide about this. Whatever I have done I have done only as the Chairman of the Committee and that secrecy is published. So there is no Report. Therefore members need not be under any apprehension that they have no right to criticise the Report. But they have no right to criticise the Chair.

***Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.**—The mistake lies in the fact that some of us are not aware of the rules prevailing in most of the Assemblies in India. Rule 153 refers to a Motion of No-confidence in Ministers and statement by a Minister who has resigned. Sub-rule (2) says:

“If the Speaker is of opinion that the motion is in order, he shall read the motion to the Assembly and shall request those members who are in favour of leave being granted to rise in their places and if not less than thirty members rise accordingly, the Speaker shall intimate that leave is granted.....”

so that a minimum of 30 members is necessary to move a no-confidence motion against the Government. The Hon'ble Minister was pleased to say “we shall follow what is prevailing in the House of the People”.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Generally.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Generally. In the House of the People consisting of 500 members the number that is necessary to move a no-confidence motion is one-tenth, *i.e.*, 50. In Bihar there are 330 members; the number that is necessary for the same motion is one-eleventh, *i.e.*, 31; in Bombay there are 396 members and the number necessary is one-tenth, *i.e.*, 40; in Madras there are 205 members and the number necessary is one-eighth *i.e.*, 25; in Mysore are 208 members and the number necessary is one-fifth, *i.e.*, 40 members till now; in West Bengal there are 238 members and the number necessary is one-eighth, *i.e.*, 28. So in none of these Assemblies it is so high as 30 members.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am only drawing the attention of the Hon'ble Member that as he happens to be a member of the Committee the Report is binding on him as a whole. It means he has agreed to the number 30. I can understand his feelings. But there is a convention to the effect that when a report is unanimous a member of the committee should not speak against the report.

Sri C. K. RAJAI AH SHETTY (Chickanaikanhally).—But he has given an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am talking about conventions. If he cannot speak against the Report he cannot also give an amendment against the Report. That is why I would request the Hon'ble Members who happen to be members of the Committee to respect that convention and if we go on breaking the convention like this we may not be able to lay any good foundation for democracy at all. That is why, with all humility, I would request the members that they should respect certain conventions. There are other members who are not parties to the Report who can take up this question

(MR. SPEAKER)

and speak. I even go further and say that since the Leader of the Opposition and some members of the Opposition are also parties to the Report they will also have to follow the convention.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Not that I am opposing the Report as such. I heard one of the members saying that we are following generally the rules prevailing in the House of the People. And Sri A. V. Narasimha Reddy said that because we were in a minority we wanted some advantage. I just wanted to place facts prevailing in the other Houses. In fact I had given an amendment with regard to the same subject. We had a discussion about this subject. Of course I agree with the Report. But to correct an impression that we are following the rule prevailing in the House of the People I am placing before this House what is prevalent elsewhere. If that is against the convention I will abide by the ruling of the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER.—I understand the mind of the Hon'ble Member. He wants to stick to the Report. But at the same time he wants to show that it is not wholly in consonance with the Lok Sabha Rules.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In regard to the observation made by the Hon'ble Speaker, I wish to say something. If a party leader is a member of a committee and he has signed the report and if a member of that party is not allowed to comment—if that convention is to hold good, then there will be no possibility of any member of the Opposition expressing his views on the report. That shuts out any expression of opinion. That stifles the work of the Legislature. It will then be very difficult. I wish I had known that. Unless the members of the Committee were selected on the basis of the parties—particularly when you are evolving a new set of rules for guiding the activities of the Legislature, I think a relaxation should be made even in regard to the convention. I do not know where this convention is operative. If you would shut out the independent views of various sections, I think it will be very difficult to evolve

a correct set of rules. I do not claim that I am wiser than the Committee. I am only expressing the view that it is possible to improve on the recommendations of the Committee. I have no intention to minimise the importance of the decisions reached by the Committee. If the Committee's Report has to be accepted by the House, then what is there for the House to discuss? Every party of the House was in the Committee. Then you shut out independent views. I should like to have a clarification on this point.

*Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—Sir, if any member had disagreed with the recommendations of the Committee, he should have dissented at the time of signing the Report. Nothing prevents them from taking that line of action. To have signed the Report and now to contend that we have to reconsider the whole position—I think that my friends have not clearly understood the position. It is only through such committees that we have to finalise some of the rules, etc. I would submit that having served on a committee and having signed the report unanimously and to contend that the question has to be reconsidered—it would not amount to a healthy convention.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I think Sri Narasimha Reddy has not properly understood my point. The question raised was not with reference to the members who served on the Committee. I was the first to speak and I expressed a few views. The point raised by me was—whether a member of the Opposition who is not a member of the committee has not got the privilege of expressing his opinion? There is no other point. Supposing a member has not given a dissenting note. He cannot say that he reserves the right to reconsider. I have served on a number of committees. Either you give a dissenting note or you do not give a dissenting note. But the point raised was different. The Hon'ble Speaker referred to convention. If two or three members of a party serve on a committee, are the other members of the party prevented from giving expression to their opinion? Is there a convention? Even if there is a conven-

tion, it cannot shut out the expression of by the other members. If there is an answer to that, I am satisfied. But he has raised something quite different.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, there are two points. One is about the point of view expressed by my Hon'ble friend Sri Srinivasa Shetty. The unfortunate thing in this case is—even before Sri Srinivasa Shetty could conclude, there has been interference. Because of the interference, this understanding has arisen. He did not say that this particular rule which is written in the Special Committee Report is wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I made it clear that he wanted to stick to the report, but yet he wanted to show that in all respects we had not followed Lok Sabha rules.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—But Sri Narasimha Reddy is trying to re-open controversies.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If he tries to re-open, let him do so.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—The other aspect is the one raised by my friend Sri Mallaradhya.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—Before Sri Narasimha Reddy could speak,.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it a point of order?

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—It is a point of order. We have been discussing these Rules and are still anticipating the ruling from the Chair with regard to the Ministry resignation—whether a statement has to be made.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—What has that got to do with this? I can only say that there is no relation. If we go on talking like this, we will be nowhere. Statement regarding the resignation of the Ministry is not relevant with regard to the adoption of the Rules. It has no relevance with the ruling that I have promised to give.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—My point is this. When the Chair has withheld a certain aspect, it should find a place under 154.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—This question does not arise at all. I am not going to

adopt these rules; it is for the House to do so. The House may or may not adopt the rules.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Are we adopting the rules piece-meal?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not know. It may be. It will be according to the wish of the whole House. If they want to adopt the rules *in toto* they may. If they want to adopt in part, they may also do so. Or if they want to adopt only a few clauses, they may do so. It is for the House.....

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Whether that ruling should be in accordance to rule 154—that would facilitate the House to take a final decision.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Deenadayalu Naidu, I will give you a chance if you wish to speak on all these points. You can say that this Report should not be adopted at all, since I have not given a ruling on the point of the statement of the resigning Ministers. It is not a point of order. It is only an interference. I cannot understand why members want to interfere, specially when they will have a chance to speak on the subject.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—I was saying only in relation to the Members that have served on the particular committee.

So far as other Members of any political party are concerned.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—If Sri. Narasimha Reddy is making a speech, I will have to give my ruling.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Before the ruling is given, I want to submit a point for your consideration.

Sir, in regard to the question as to who should participate in this discussion, I respectfully submit, Sir, that we are attempting to determine for the first time the Rules of Procedure for the conduct of the business in this Hon'ble House. The Rules will be in force for quite some time to come. In respect of such a vital matter, it would not be very correct to shut out members belonging to whichever party there may be. The signatories no doubt had an opportunity to ventilate their views in the Committee during its deliberations. But I humbly submit that

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

it is not correct to take an extreme position and say that the signatories need not speak and opportunities may be given only to the others. In this case, Sri Kenchappa has not signed the Report. Therefore some *via media* has to be struck. That is my submission, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not my intention that the discussion on an important matter such as this should be stifled. After all, the Rules of Procedure and the Report, stands on a different footing altogether. This has to be viewed in a different aspect. I was under the impression that when it was signed by the members of the Opposition, they had had every chance of discussion about the Report in their respective Parties. If that was not so, it is really unfortunate. They ought to have availed of such an opportunity and they ought to have discussed the Report in their party and come to certain conclusions so that in the Special Committee we would have had the general benefit of their views. After all, this Report has been before the House for over a year and a quarter. And this time is more than sufficient for the members to put their heads together and come to conclusions.

Confusion, I think, has arisen on account of the fact that there was no collective discussion on the part of the Opposition. If there was such a discussion, this confusion would not have arisen. When the Report of the Special Committee was placed before the House after the Report of the Rule-making Committee was before the House for some long time, it would have been better if the Members of the opposition had discussions among themselves. After all, the Special Committee was a committee of the House and not a Governmental Committee. So looking at it from that point of view, when the Report is a unanimous one, there should not be any difficulty in adopting it as early as possible.

If it was a fact that there was no opportunity or that there was no

discussion of this Report in the Opposition, I would have no objection to discuss this Report in some detail in the House. In short, if it is the intention of the members that this should be discussed in all its detail, I have no objection. But, it would be desirable that when a report is signed by the Leader of the Opposition and also members of the Opposition, it should go as relatively uncontested as possible.

SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN.—May I submit one point, Sir. I am not of course questioning the Ruling of the Chair. I take it that it is only a convention.

In regard to the question of collective discussion, I may submit here that inside the Committee also, we try to reflect as much of the collective viewpoint as possible. But at times, the atmosphere is a little different in committees, and we cannot press our point of view to its logical conclusion. In our individual capacity, in order to carry on Committee's working as smoothly as possible, at times, we are compelled to agree to certain things with reservations. There is a difference between pressing our differences to the point of a dissenting note and somehow or other agreeing to see that the work might get on smoothly and efficiently. That does not mean that necessarily we are tying down the entire opposition to this matter. You know that in such matters, it is very difficult to have collective discussion in a party. Especially in such matters, it would not be possible. There are very strong differences of opinion even among members of one party; sometimes, every one will be anxious to press his own point. Our consent to this Report should be taken only in this light. It does not suggest that we are tying down either now or in the future the Opposition in all matters. If the Chair were to rigidly enforce the ruling, I can straightaway say, it would be very difficult to serve on any committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I can quote here one instance of the Estimates Committee. There is a convention that the Report of the Estimates Committee

should be unanimous. There should be no dissenting note. It is a convention. Of course, I understand the practical difficulties of my Hon'ble friend in particular and of the Opposition in general. But, we have to evolve certain methods and we have to evolve certain conventions which would smoothen matters.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I should like to know if at the time the Lok Sabha adopted its Rules, whether at that stage when the matter came up for consideration, the members of the Opposition who were not members of the particular committee did or did not express their independent views in regard to any specific question or in general.

MR. SPEAKER.—I am not aware as to what happened in Lok Sabha. I think the Lok Sabha has not yet adopted the Rules. But so far as Bombay Assembly is concerned, we did not discuss such a report for a long time.

The House adjourned for Lunch at Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ವಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮದ ವಿಧಾನದ ಬಂದು ಕರಡು ಮಸೂದೆಯು ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅದರ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲು ನಾನು ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನನಗೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನನ್ನ ಮಿತ್ರರು ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿರುವ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರ ಕ್ರಮಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂಥ ಅಂಶದ ಮೇಲೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಒಂದು ಪದ್ಧತಿಯು ಇದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ಪೀಕಿತರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗಳ ಮೂಲಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ಪದ್ಧತಿಯು ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ಭಾರತ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅರಂಭವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಅರಂಭವಾಗಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಒಂದು ಅನುಭವವನ್ನು ಈ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆ ಪಡೆದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ

L.A.

ಅದೊಂದು ಅತಿಶಯೋಕ್ತಿ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಭಾವಿಸಬಾರದು.

[SRI K. M. DEVAYYA in the Chair]

ನಾನು ಹಿಂದಿನ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯನಾಗಿದ್ದೆನು. ಮೆಟ್ಟುಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಸಾರಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಡೆದ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚುನಾಯಿತನಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯನಾಗಿದ್ದೆನು. ಅವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಸದಸ್ಯನಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಕ್ಷಪಕ್ವದ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನೂ ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿ ದ್ವಾರೆಯೋ ಅದು ಉಳಿದ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗಳಿಗಿಂತಲೂ, ಹಾಗೂ ಲೋಕ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಪದ್ಧತಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಇನ್ನೂ ಒಂದು ಹೆಜ್ಜೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ನಾನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಮಗೆ ದೊರಕಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅನುಭವದ ಅಂಶಗಳು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿವೆ. ಶಾಸನಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕಳಿಸಿದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಮುದ್ರಿಸಿ ಒದಗಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಉತ್ತಮ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಈ ನಮ್ಮ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಮುದ್ರಿಸಿ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ ಲೋಕ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ ಇತರ ಯಾವುದೇ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ಎಲ್ಲರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿರಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳಿಸಿದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮೊದಲೇ ಉತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ಮುದ್ರಿಸಿ ಕೊಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಆತನಿಗೆ ಉಪಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಮ ಇಲ್ಲಿದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ, ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ 15 ದಿನಗಳ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿರತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಹತ್ತು ದಿವಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಬರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಲೋಕ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಂದು ತ್ರೈತೀಯ ನಿಯಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ ಅಂಥ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟೇರಿಯಟ್ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅವಧಿ ಹಿಡಿಯಬಹುದು. ಬಹು ತೇಕವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದರೆ ಇದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಆದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿತ್ಯದ ಅಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ತಹಸೀಲಿನಿಂದ ಉತ್ತರ ತರಿಸಿ ಸಮಾಚಾರ ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುವಂತಹ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದು ನಾವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಅನುಭವದಿಂದ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕೇವಲ 15 ದಿವಸಗಳ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಏನು ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಇದು ಸೂಕ್ತವೂ ಸಮಂಜಸವೂ ಆಗಿದೆ. ತಹಸೀಲಿನಿಂದ ಉತ್ತರ ತರಿಸಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕೇವಲ ಹತ್ತು ದಿವಸಗಳೊಳಗೆ ತರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಮನಗಾಣಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಮನವಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಎರಡನೆಯದು, ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದಂಥ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಲಾಯಿತು. 209 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇದ್ದೇವೆ. 15 ದಿವಸಗಳೊಳಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಒದಗಿಸ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎ. ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ)

ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಕರಡು ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಏನನ್ನು ನಮೂದಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ 15 ದಿವಸಗಳ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಲೇಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸಿದಮೇಲೆ ಅವು ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಸಂಶಯವನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲವು. ಅದರ ಆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ಇಂಥ ದಿವಸವೇ ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾವೇನಾದರೂ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಉಂಟಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಕಷ್ಟವೇನು ಎಂಬುದು ಬೆಳಗ್ಗೆ ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆ ಅನುಸರಿಸುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಅಂಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಅಂತಹ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಈ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅದನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸದೇ ಹೋಗುವುದು ಧರ್ಮವಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಿಸುವುದು ಸಹಜ. ಅದನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತಾದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸುವುದು ಧರ್ಮ. ನಮ್ಮ ಅನುಭವದಿಂದ, ಮತ್ತು ವ್ಯವಹಾರದಿಂದ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಬೇಕಾದಂಥ ಒಂದು ಕಾರಾವ ಕಾತದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಹದಿನೈದು ದಿವಸಗಳ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಏನು ಸೂಚಿತವಾಗಿದೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ಪೀಕರರು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ನಂಬಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಶಾಸನ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕೇಳತಕ್ಕ ದಿವಸವೇ ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ಇದು ನಡೆಯದೆ ಮಾತು. ಬೆಳಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಲು ಒಂದೇದಿವಸ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದಾದಂಥ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಬರಬಹುದು. ಅದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಬೆರೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಹಾಗಾಯಿತು? ವಸ್ತುತಃ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂತಹ ಕಲಂನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೇ ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಪ್ರಯಾರಿಟಿ ಬೇಸಿಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವುದು ಮೊದಲು ಬರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಲು ಅವರ ವಿವೇಚನೆಗೆ ಬಿಡೋಣ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The notice of 15 days will stand, but the date on which that question is to be answered orally on the floor of the House has to be left to the member to determine or specify and it is for the Speaker to fix it up. Supposing you get the answer within 15 days and you put it down for being answered on a day when the member is not here. So, it should be the privilege of the member to say, "I shall not be here on that day and please put it down for being answered on such and such a day."

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎ. ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಒಂದು ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಕಚೇರಿಗೆ ವಹಿಸಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದು ವಸ್ತುತಃ ನಮ್ಮ ಗುರಿಯನ್ನು ಸಾಧಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಕೇಳಿದ ದಿವಸ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸು

ವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ವಶಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಡೋಣ. ಎಂದರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅದು ನಾವು ಅನುಸರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗದ ವಿಷಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಚೇರಿಗೂ ಒಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟುಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—The Hon'ble Minister while placing this Report before the House said that generally we had followed the Lok Sabha Rules. This rule is in vogue in Lok Sabha. I do not know why you are opposing it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎ. ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳಿದೆ, ಈ ಪ್ರಶೋತ್ತರಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಲೋಕ ಸಭೆಯ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಗಿಂತಲೂ ಭಿನ್ನವಾದ ಒಂದು ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ನಮ್ಮಗಳ ಒಂದು ಅನುಭವದಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸತಕ್ಕ, ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕಳುಹಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳ ರೂಪರೇಖೆಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದು ಅದಕ್ಕನುಸಾರ ವಾದಂತಹ ರೀತಿ ಯಾವುದು, ಸಮಂಜಸವಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆ ಯಾವುದೋ ಯಾವುದು ಅನುಸರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೋ ಅಂತಹ ಒಂದು ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಆ ಒಂದು ಕಲಂವನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಮೊದಲೇ ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ರೆಪ್ರೆಸೆಂಟೇಟಿವ್‌ಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದಾಗಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೌಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಕಾಮನ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್‌ನೇ ಜನರಲ್ ಆಗಿ ಆಡಾಪ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಇದು, non-official procedure, ಒಂದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ, ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯ ಮಾದರಾನುತರಣ ಇದೆ. ಅದರ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರೂ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಪ್ರಶೋತ್ತರ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯವರ ಅನುಭವಪೂರ್ವಕವಾದ ಒಂದು ಕಲಂವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಪಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಲೋಕ ಸಭೆಗಿಂತಲೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹಾಕಿದಾಗ ಇಂಥ ದಿವಸ ಇಂಥ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆ ದಿವಸ ಉತ್ತರ ಒದಗುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಶಾಸನ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಚ್ಚಾದ ಪ್ರತಿ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾದಂಥ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಮರೆಯಬಾರದು. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿನಂತಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅನಂತರ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತ ಒಂದು ಕಾಪಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ, ಒಂದು ಕಾಪಿಯನ್ನು ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಾಪಿಯನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮೂರು ಕಾಪಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಇದರಿಂದ ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವಾದ ತೊಂದರೆಯುಂಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಮಾಡಿದರು. ಇದರ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯಿತು. ಏನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಬಂತು ಎಂದರೆ: ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆ ಯಾವ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆಯಿಂದ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ? ಅತಿ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ, ಇಡೀ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ರದ್ದುಮಾಡಿ, ಸಂಸದನ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದಂಥ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ

ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವಂಥಾ ಸೂಚನೆ ಇದು. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದು ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ಉತ್ತರ ನಮಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾಪಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ, ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ—ಅದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಅನುಭವಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿರುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಆಫೀಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅದರ ಕಾಪಿ ಮಾಡಿ

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ನಾವು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಾ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ವಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ನಮಗೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾದರೂ ಚಿಂತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ಆಫೀಸಿನವರಿಗೆ ವಹಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಿಸಿದ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಸಾಧಿತವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—Is the Secretary different from the Speaker as far as office matters are concerned?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ವಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಅದಕ್ಕೇ ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅವರು ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಮನೆಯಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಇದು ಬರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕಾಲ ಹಿಡಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—It is the duty of the Secretary to place before the Speaker whatever important thing comes up to him at the shortest notice. What is the use of sending one copy to the Speaker and another to the Secretary? There is no meaning in doing that.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ವಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ಸುಸೂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾದರೆ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಸಹಕರಿಸಿದರೇ ನಡೆಯುವುದು. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಿಲುವು ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ಉತ್ತರ ಸಿಕ್ಕಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮೂರು ಕಾಪಿ ಬರೆದು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೇನೂ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ, ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಈಗ ಹೋಗುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಇಡೀ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಮೊದಲು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅಶಿಸ್ತಾರೋ, ಅದರ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಕರಿಸಿ ಮೂರು ಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಅಂದರೆನು, ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಪುರಸ್ಕೃತಿ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಪುರಸ್ಕೃತಿರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ವಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಈ ಸಭೆಯ 209 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ನೋಡಿ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಕೆಲಸ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಪುರಸ್ಕೃತಿಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆಂತ ತಮ್ಮ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಪುರಸ್ಕೃತಿಯೆಂದೇ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು.

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೊಬ್ಬರು.—Army of officers ಇಲ್ಲವೇ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, something must be settled in this matter

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—I am not yielding, ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ, ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು...

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, I rise to a point of order. Who is he to ask me to sit down? Is he in order? He should know his limitations. I want a ruling from the Chair whether a member is permitted to do so and whether he can ask me to sit down. Am I here to obey him or the Chair?

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—He is repeating, Sir.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—[am not repeating. When I have raised a point of order the Hon'ble Member must yield.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—A point of order has been raised on this side and I think my friend Sri Narasimha Reddy should yield before a decision is given by the Chair.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—When a point of order is raised other members also have a right to reply before the Chair gives a ruling. In fact I was replying to the point of order raised by my friend Sri Muckannappa. Not that I wanted to stand persistently. Let them not mistake me about that.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—This is a very ingenious way of explaining things. When a point of order is raised, unless the Speaker, before he gives a ruling, asks other members to speak, they cannot speak. The Speaker has not even said anything with regard to the point of order raised; still my friend Sri Narasimha Reddy justifies his stand.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—My Hon'ble friend Sri Muckannappa raised a point of order and he had his say. Sri Narasimha Reddy was pointing out that he was not yielding. He was saying, emphasising the fact that he was not yielding. That is the impression I got.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—To say that “I am not yielding” is different from saying “sit down”. He is entirely within his right to say that he is not yielding but he cannot ask the member to sit down.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—My friend Sri Narasimha Reddy asked me to sit down; am I here to obey him or the Chair? I expect a ruling from the Chair whether he is in order or not when he said that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Sri K.M. Devayya).—He said he was not yielding.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—He specifically said “sit down”. You may go through the official report. Am I to obey the Chair or Sri Narasimha Reddy? If I have to sit down according to his direction I think I have to obey Sri Narasimha Reddy and ignore the Chair. I want a ruling from the Chair whether my point of order is in order or not.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—May I submit, Sir? A point of order has been raised by Sri Muckannappa. I was only saying that he was interrupting me not once but for the second time and that I was not prepared to yield. When I am not yielding courtesy requires that he should sit down. If he has taken it in a different sense, in a sense which I have not meant, I do not know how to help him. The subject on which I was speaking was the Report of the Special Committee. The point of order raised by Sri Muckannappa, I am afraid, does not come within the purview of the subject under discussion or anything else. I therefore submit that the point of order raised by him is no point of order and I request the Chair to give a ruling.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Is this a ruling given by the Chair or by my friend?

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—It is just an explanation that he could not yield.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—If you go through the official report and find that he has not said so, I shall certainly withdraw what I have spoken. Here it is not a question of courtesy but whether my friend is in

order or not—that is all we want to know from the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—In view of the explanation given by Sri Narasimha Reddy, that he never meant anything and that he was saying that he was not yielding.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir...

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore City).—I rise to a point of order.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Pending disposal of a point of order, can there be another point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Pending disposal?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—The Chairman was pleased to give a ruling on the point of order. Immediately after that you took the Chair. Is it open to a member to raise the same question and ask for a ruling from you, Sir? That is my point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I humbly submit to the Chair that there was no ruling. It was under discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Was there no ruling?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Chairman was just clarifying the position that Sri Narasimha Reddy never meant anything and in the meanwhile the Speaker came in and occupied the Chair.

4 P.M.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—As a matter of fact, I resumed discussion on the Report.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Is it over, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is over.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ವಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಈ ಅಡ್‌ಜರ್ನ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮೂರು ಕಾಪಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ, ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾಪಿ, ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾಪಿ, ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾಪಿ ಕೂಡಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ಪದ್ಧತಿ ರೋಕನೆಯಲ್ಲ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಂತೋಷ. ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಮಹತ್ತರ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಈ ಒಂದು ಅಡ್‌ಜರ್ನ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೋಷನ್‌ನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮೋಷನ್‌ನ ಕಾಪಿ ಕೂಡರೇ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು

ಮೂರು ಕಾಪಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೇ ಎನಾ, ಅನ್ಯತಾ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದೀರ್ಘವಾದ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟು ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ವಿಷಯವಾದುದೇಂದರೆ, ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವ ಒಂದು ಕಲಮು. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದರು 30 ಜನಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಎಂದು. ನೆರೆಹೊರೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳ ನಿರ್ದೇಶನಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ತತ್ವದ ಮೇಲೆ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಶಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಸಮನಮವಾಗಿ ಬೆಳೆಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ, 30 ಜನ ಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಪಕ್ಷ ಬೇಕಾದ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು 20ಕ್ಕೆ ಇಳಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಐದನೆಯ ಪುಷ್ಟೀಕರಿಸಿದರು. ಅದೇ ಒಂದು ಕಾರಣವನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಪಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾರತ ಬಾಲ್ಯಾವಸ್ಥೆಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯದ ಮೇಲೆ, ಪಕ್ಷಗಳ ಬಲಾಬಲಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವ ಪ್ರಥಮ ಹೆಜ್ಜೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಒಂದು ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ, ನಾವುಗಳು ಒಂದು ಮೆಚ್ಚುರಿತ ಪಡೆಯದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ, ಈ ಮೋಕ್ಷನನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರುವ ಜನರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೂ ಕಡಮೆಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ನಿತ್ಯ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗೆ ತೊಡಕನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ; ಅದು ಸಹಾಯಕ ವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಎರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸಿಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ, ಅಂಥ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ 30 ಜನರಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಖಂಡಿತ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ವಾದ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅದೇ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದಲೇ ಈ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ದಿನ ಬೆಳಗಾದರೆ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳು ಬಂದು, ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುವ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನೀವು ಮನಗಾಣಬೇಕು. ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳು ಬೆಳೆಯಬೇಕು; ಆದರೆ ಅವುಗಳು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ, ರಚನಾತ್ಮಕ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕು; ದೇಶದ ಹಿತವನ್ನು ಸಾಧನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅವಾಗ ಒಂದು maturity ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಳಿಸಿ, ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಂತಹ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶ ಉಂಟಾಗುವಂತಹ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕುದು ಧರ್ಮ, ಇಷ್ಟು ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗಳು ಸುಗಮವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮುರಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಈ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ದಿನಬೆಳಗಾದರೆ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಇದ್ದು, ನಿತ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆ ಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಈ ಒಂದುವರೆ ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 20ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಇದ್ದೂ, No-confidence motion ಬಂದ ಅವಕಾಶಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟು ಒದಗಿದವು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ವಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹರಾಜ್.—ಅದೇ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ, ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಎಷ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಏನು? ಪಾದಕ್ಕೆ ವಾದ ಇದ್ದೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟರ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ, ಈ ಮೂವತ್ತರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದುದು ಎಂದು ದೃಢನಂಬಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ; ಮತ್ತು ಈ ವರದಿಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿ, ನನ್ನ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಟಿವ್ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನೊಂದು ವಿಧಾನಕ, ಏನೊಂದು ರೂಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ, ಆ ರೂಲುಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಜೇದವುಂಟಾದರೂ, ಈ ಸಭಾ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ತಯಾರಿಸಿರುವ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಿಂತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದೆ. ಅವುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೂ ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಇವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಗಿದೆ, ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿಯಲ್ಲಿ, ಮದ್ರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ, ಬಂಗಾಳದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ನಾನಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೂ ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಕರೆಯಬೇಕು, ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕವಾಗಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಎತ್ತಬೇಕು, Short Notice Question ಹೇಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಬಹುದು, ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ದಿವಸದೊಳಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಮುಂತಾದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿವೆ. ಓದುವಾಗ, ಮಹಾಭಾರತದ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಮಾರವ್ಯಾಸ ಒಂದು ಪದ್ಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾನೆ. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ: ಆ ಕಾವ್ಯವನ್ನು ಓದಿದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪಾಪಗಳೂ ದೂರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ, ಬ್ರಹ್ಮಹತ್ಯೆ, ಗೋಹತ್ಯೆ, ಶಿಶುಹತ್ಯೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ದೂರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವನು. ಇದನ್ನು ಓದಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ. ಎಲ್ಲಯೂ ಹತ್ಯಾಕಾಂಡವೇ—ಸ್ತ್ರೀಹತ್ಯೆ..... ರೇವನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಗಾಭರಿಯಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಗೋಹತ್ಯೆಕ್ಕೂ, ಶಿಶುಹತ್ಯೆಕ್ಕೂ, Rules of Procedure ಗೂ ಏನು ಸಂಬಂಧ ಎಂದು ದಿಗ್ಭ್ರಮೆ ಆಯಿತು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ನೀವು ರಾಯರ್ ಆಗಿದ್ದವರು. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಕೇಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಗೆಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದೆ, ರಂಗೂನ್, ಕಲ್ಕತ್ತಾ, ಅಲಹಾಬಾದ್ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಗಳು ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಿವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಧರ್ಮ, ನ್ಯಾಯ ಮತ್ತು ಸತ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನೂ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ, ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಕ್ರೋಡೀಕರಿಸಿ, ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ?

ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳು ಹೇಗೆ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಭಾರತದ ಸಂವಿಧಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಅರ್ಚಿಕರ್ ಇದೆ. ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಮಹಾಭಾರತದಲ್ಲಿ ಹದಿನೆಂಟು ಪರ್ವಗಳಿವೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಓದಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಅತ್ಯಾಚಾರ, ಅನಾಚಾರ, ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ವೇದ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಚೌಕಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈ ಮಹಾಭಾರತವನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ರೋಪದೋಷಗಳನ್ನು ಅಪ್ಪಾಗಿ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಡಿ, ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.....ಇದು ಮಹಾಭಾರತವಲ್ಲ, ಇದು ಭಗವದ್ಗೀತೆ ಇದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಆಗಲ, ಗೀತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಕೃಷ್ಣನು ಅರ್ಜುನನನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ಎದುರು ಪಕ್ಷದವರಲ್ಲಿ ಸತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅವರನ್ನು ಹೊಡೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾನೆ. ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು (party in power) ನಾವು 140 ಜನ ರಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಎದುರು ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರನ್ನು ಹೊಡೆಯರೋ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಹಾಗೆ.....

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—A point of clarification, Sir. This is not the official Report placed on behalf of the Government. It is a Report placed on behalf of the House, on behalf of the Committee, that was entrusted with the task of framing the Rules. It is not the Government or the Congress Party that has placed this Report for consideration of this House.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.....ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆ. ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ಪೀಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಶೆಟ್ಟರೂ, ನರಸಿಂಹ ಅವರೂ ಕಮಿಷನರಲ್ಲಿ ಪಟ್ಟ ಕಪ್ಪೆ, ಅವರ ಮಾತು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಡೆಯಿತು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ವ್ಯಾಕುಲವಾಯಿತು.....

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I was watching the debate. I never heard any Hon'ble Member speaking in that strain. Otherwise, they would not have signed the Report.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the proceedings of the Special Committee are confidential. No member of the Assembly who happened to be a member of the Special Committee can give out the secrets in relation to the proceedings before that Committee. I have not heard that any member has given any such information as to what happened in the Committee. Even though I was not here, I was hearing the speeches in my Assembly Chamber. I did not observe any of the Hon'ble Members giving out secrets of what happened in the Committee.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ಶೆಟ್ಟರು ಕಮಿಷನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು. ಅವರು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟಿನ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಮಧ್ಯೆ intervention ಮಾಡಿ ಶ್ರೀ ನರಸಿಂಹ ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತ ಕಮಿಟಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಪ್ಪೆವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು ಪರಿಪೋಷಿತವಾಗುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ತೊಂದರೆ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು.

ತಾವು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಕಮಿಷನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ 18 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಪೈಕಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನು—he is above party—ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಉಳಿದವರಲ್ಲಿ 11 ಜನ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಆರು ಜನರು ಇತರರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಹನ್ನೊಂದು ಜನರು ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಆರು ಜನರು ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಇದ್ದು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯಾದುದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಹೇಳುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹನ್ನೊಂದು ಜನ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ, ಆರು ಜನ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಮಿಷನ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಆರಿಸಿದವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯವರು. ಬರೀ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಲ್ಲ.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—It was not through election

Mr. SPEAKER.—It also follows the proportion in which parties are represented in the House—the majority party and the Opposition. From that point of view, there is too much weightage in favour of the Opposition.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—There is no question of the Committee being one-sided. All of them are on one side.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, all of them are on one side ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈಗ ನಾವು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕೆಲವು ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಉದಾರವಾಗಿ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಈ ವರದಿಯಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. In toto ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅನುಮಾನ ಪಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ? I cannot understand why he is so reluctant. ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕೇಳಿ, ಮಹಾ ಪ್ರಭು!

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I am sorry to intervene at every stage, because he is provoking me. I have not moved this motion as a Minister of Mysore Government. As a member of the Special Committee, I have moved this motion.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Why should I wound the feelings of the Revenue Minister.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—No, no. It is not a question of wounding his feelings. You can wound his feelings if there is occasion for it. But he is not moving this motion in the capacity of the Revenue Minister. That is the point.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಇದನ್ನು ತಾವೇ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ. ಹನ್ನೊಂದು ಜನ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಮತ್ತು ಆರು ಜನ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಹೇಗೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಮಾಧಾನವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ನನ್ನ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಭಯ ದೂರವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಭಯಗ್ರಸ್ತನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಎರಡು

ಕಡೆಯೂ ಒಂದೇ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದರೆ ಆಗ ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ.

ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರ ವಾದವನ್ನೂ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆಂದರೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ತಾಮಸಮನೋವೃತ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ, ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ಶೀಘ್ರವಾಗಿ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ, ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದೆರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಮೇಲೆ ಉತ್ತರ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ, ಹಾಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ಬಂದಾಗ ಯಾವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆಂದೋ ಆ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸಫಲವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ಏನಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಈ ರೋಗಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಔಷಧಿಯನ್ನು ಕಂಡು ಹಿಡಿಯಬೇಕು ಎಂದು, ಎಲ್ಲ ಪಕ್ಷ ಪಂಗಡಗಳನ್ನೂ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನೊಳಗೊಂಡ ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆ ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಿತು. ಅವರು ಎಲ್ಲ ವನ್ನೂ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ಈ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ ಯವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತ ರೋಗ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಾನು ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಭದ್ರವಾದ ಬುನಾದಿಯಮೇಲೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತರಲು 20 ಜನರು ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಾರಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ? ಆಳುವ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಯಂಟಿನವ ಜನರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಲ ಈ ಅವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ; ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಲ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಮುಂದೆ, ನಾನು ಮುಂದೆ ಎಂದು ರೇಸ್ ಕುಮರೆಗಳು ಓಡುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಓಡಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. 30 ಜನರಾದರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ 20 ಜನರಾದರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದು ಸಾಧುವಾದುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾದುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಿಜವಾದ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಆಡಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ, ಆಡಳಿತ ನಿಯೋಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ಸೂಚನೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. 20 ಜನ ಎಂದು ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಕೂಡ ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಏಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ request concede ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ? ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಂದೇ ಕಡೆ ಇದ್ದೆವು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ಗಾಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮೋಟಾರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಂದೇ ಕಡೆ ಕುಳಿತರೆ ಗಾಡಿಯು ಉರುಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ equal balance ಇರಬೇಕು. ದೋಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೇ ಕಡೆ ಭಾರವಾದರೆ ಮುಳುಗಿ ಹೋಗುತ್ತೇವೆ. ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಅದರಿಂದ ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಹೊಂದುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಯಾರಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಹೇಗೆ ಬೆಳೆಯಬೇಕು, ಅದು ಹೇಗೆ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ರೋಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾದ ಅನಂತಶಯನಂ ಅಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ ಅವರ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ನಾವೆಲ್ಲ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾದ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷವಿರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಪಂಡಿತ ಜವಹರಲಾಲ್ ನೆಹರೂ ಅವರು ನಹ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಬೆಳೆಯಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಒಂದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷ

ವಿರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾವು ಈ ಕಡೆ ಕುಳಿತಿರುವವರು, 30 ಜನ ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ 20 ಜನ ಎಂದು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಪ್ಪೇನಿದೆ? ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಶೆಟ್ಟರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತ ಇಂಥಂಥ ಕಡೆ ಇಪ್ಪಿಪ್ಪು ಜನ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ 80 ಜನ ರಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಇನ್ನು ಅರೇಖ ಜನರನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿದರೆ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದು ಬೋಲೊಬ್ಬ ನಾಯಕರನ್ನು ತರಬಹುದು ಎಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ನಾವು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಲು ಇಪ್ಪು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ. ನಾವೇನೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲವನ್ನು ಕಿತ್ತುಹಾಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದವರು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಕಲಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸಾರ್ಥಕವೇನೋ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಹೋಗಲಿ, ಈ ವರದಿಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ 40 ಇಟ್ಟಿದೆ, ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ 30 ಇಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ 20 ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು, ಈಗ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ 30 ಇಡಿ, ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ 20 ಇಡಿ ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಹೇಳುವುದು. ಹೀಗೆ 30, 40 ಎನ್ನುವುದೇ? ಈ ರಕ್ತವನ್ನು ಯಾರು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಟ್ಟರು? ಎಂಟನೆಯ ಒಂದುಭಾಗ ಅಥವಾ ನಾಲ್ಕನೆಯ ಒಂದುಭಾಗ ಎಂದಿರಬೇಕು. ನಲವತ್ತು, ಮೂವತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೇಲಿಟ್ಟರು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ತಮ್ಮ ಪೈ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ವಂತರು ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಭಾಗ ಮಾಡುವುದು? ಅಥವಾ ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಜನ ನಾವು, ನಾವು ಹೇಳಿದುದೇ ವೇದವಾಕ್ಯವೆಂಬ ಮನೋಭಾವದಿಂದ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ? ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಮದುವೆ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮದುವೆ ಮಂತ್ರ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು ತಿಥಿ ವಂತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೇ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ದರಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು ದೋಷಗಳವೆಯೋ ಅವುಗಳ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆಲವು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಶ್ರೀ ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ ಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅವರ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂಥಂಥಾದ್ದು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆ! ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷವನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. 1962 ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯ ಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ ಏನೇನಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೋ, ಆಗ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I raise an objection. The Hon'ble Member cannot be permitted to say that the Speaker is the Speaker of this side or that side. He cannot give an impression that the Speaker is a member of a particular party.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like to know from the Hon'ble Member Sri Muckannappa whether he meant that the Speaker was a Speaker of this side and next time the Speaker would be from the other side. After all the Speaker is a Speaker for the whole House and if he means that I am a Speaker only from Congress Party, I would like to be enlightened by him.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—What I meant was, ಬೇರೆ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಇದ್ದಾಗ, ಅವರು ಈ ಕಡೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ, ಬೇರೆ ರೀತಿ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಏನೋ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ, ಅಷ್ಟೆ. He has not at all understood my intention because the Hon'ble the Revenue Minister is in a muddle of confusion.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅವರು confuse ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ, ಈಗ ನೀವು ತಿದ್ದಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಹಾಗೆಲ್ಲ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಇಡೀ ಸಭೆಗೇ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್. ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುವ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್‌ಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯ. ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಒಂದು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದು ಮುಖ್ಯವೆ ಅಥವಾ ಅಲ್ಲವೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೊನ್ನೆ ತಾನೆ ಒಂದು ಇಂಥ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಒದಿದರು. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ, ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ನಡೆಯಬಾರದ ವಿಷಯ ನಡೆದರೆ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪಾತ್ರವೇನು, ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಪಾತ್ರವೇನು ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಲು ಇಂಥ ಸೂಚನೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಬಂತು. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೂ ಸಭೆಗೂ ನಾನು ಕೃತಜ್ಞನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿರುವ ಈ ರೂಝೆನಲ್ಲ, ಅಂಥ ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಒಂದು ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಪೀಕರಿಗೆ, ಒಂದನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತೊಂದನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೊಡುವುದು ರೋಚಕ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ರೋಚಕ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲರೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ಸಂಗತಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವರ್ತಮಾನ ತರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಅವರು ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಯಜಮಾನರೆಂದು ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ನಾವು ಸವಾಲು ಹಾಕುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದುದು ಧರ್ಮ, ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೇಕೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ? ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಯವರಿಗೂ ಸ್ಪೀಕರಿಗೂ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಆದರೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೇಕೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ? ಮದುವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 'ತೆರೆ' ಕಟ್ಟುವುದು ಗಂಡು ಹೆಣ್ಣಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ, ಬೇರೆಯವರಿಗಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಿಮಗೆ ನಾವು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ

ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕಚೇರಿಗೆ ನಾವು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ತಾವು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೀರೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ರೋಚನೆಯ ವಿಷಯವೇ ಬೇರೆ, ಅದು ಇಡೀ ಹಿಂದೂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೇ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಸಭೆ, ಯಾವ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರವಾಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾ ರೋ ಏನೋ ಅದಕಾರಣ ಅವರು ಟುಂಕ್ ಚಲಿಪೋನಿಂದಲೋ ಹೇಗೋ ವಿಷಯ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯೇ ಬೇರೆ, ಬಿಜಾಪುರಕೂಡ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಿಂದ ವಿಷ್ಣು ದೂರ ! ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಹೊರಟರೆ ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ತಲಪುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಹೊರಟರೆ ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ತಲಪುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಇದು ಸ್ಪೆಟ್‌ನಿಕ್ ಯುಗ. (ನಗು !)

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಬಿಜಾಪುರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮೈನುಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾವು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿವೇನೋ unbiased view ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾವು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅವರು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದು 'ಕುಯೋ ಮರೋ' ಎನ್ನುವರು. ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಸ್ವಭಾವದಂತೆ ನೀವು ಮರುಕೆ ಗೊಂಡು, ಹೋಗಲು ಒಂದು ಸ್ಪೆಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಬಿಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.....

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ರೂಝೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ ಅಥವಾ ಬಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡರೆ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇಡವೆ ಎಂದು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. I disallow them in my chambers when I find that there is no *prima facie* case. When I feel a doubt, I bring it to the House, and hear both sides. where there is *prima facie* case I allow it.

Sri C. K. RAJAI AH SETTY.—The question of reference to Government arises only when the Speaker feels that there is a *prima facie* case. In such cases only the Government has to be consulted. So, where is the necessity of the member sending a copy to the Minister himself ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—In some cases even before hearing the member I must hear the Government. So, in those cases they have to get notice.

4-30 P.M.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Why should the Government come to know about it before the Speaker announces that there is such and such adjournment motion ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not a game of chess. We have to inform the parties concerned. Whenever there is an adjournment motion about which I feel

some doubt I come to the House with it. Naturally, the Hon'ble Minister must have notice of it before he comes to the House and gives a statement which will enable me to decide whether I should allow it or not. If I allow it, certain number of members must rise in their seats and if the required number gets up, the normal business of the House will be adjourned and two hours will be allotted to discuss the adjournment motion. That means, the Government will have to be pre-informed because they have to prepare. Otherwise, they will not to be in a position to reply. The Hon'ble Member Sri Mallaradhya asks why not adopt the Rules of Procedure of the Lok Sabha *in toto*. Rule 54 is copied from the Lok Sabha *in toto*. Even if a member does not give notice to the Minister, my office will have to do it. That will be the only change. Some members asked why not fix up the time and ask the Minister to give a reply. This practice is in vogue in Lok Sabha. So far as I am aware, in no State Assembly such a procedure has been adopted in spite of the fact that the Lok Sabha procedure had been before them for a long time. They thought that it was impossible for them to adopt such a procedure.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ:—ಇಷ್ಟನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾನಾ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು. ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಇಫಫೂಯೆನ್ಸ್ ಬರಬಹುದು, ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಮುಖಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹೋದರೂ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು. ಹಾಗೇನಾದರೂ ಆಗಿ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ನೂಟನೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ದೊರೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನೋಟೀಸನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಆಫೀಸಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದಮೇಲೆ ತಾವು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅವಗಾಹನೆಗೆ ತರಬಹುದು. ಮರು ನೋಟೀಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಟೈಪ್‌ರೈಟಿಂಗ್‌ನಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಗುಮಾಸ್ತರು ನಮ್ಮ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ನಾವೇ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ತಮ ಗಾದರೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಆಫೀಸು, ನಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಇದೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಮುಂಚೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಆಫೀಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಏದೆ. ಅದೇ ಅನುಕೂಲ. ನಾವು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಅದರ ನಮಗಿರುವ ಅವಕಾಶದೊಳಗೆ ನಾವು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಮನೆಗೆ ಹೋದಾಗ ಆಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಆಫೀಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಥೇಂಟರಿಗೆ ಹೋದಾಗ ಆಗಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕದೇ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು. ಸಭೆ ಆರಂಭವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎರಡು ಗಂಟೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ನೋಟೀಸು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಆ ಅವಧಿ

ಯೊಳಗೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಣಲು ನಮಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿರಬಹುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಮ್ಮ ಆಫೀಸಿಗೆ ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ನೂಟನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿರುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸುವುದೇ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಮಾರ್ಗವೆಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಆಮೇಲೆ ಹತ್ತು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉಪ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕೇಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅವಕ್ಕೆ ಚುಕ್ಕೆ ಗುರುತು ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಇದ ವರೆಗೆ ಇದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ವರ್ಷವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಾಪಿಮಾಡಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಆಫೀಸಿನಿಂದ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನೂತ್ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ನಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವ ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಕಾಗದ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವ ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಹೀಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಅಧಿವೇಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹತ್ತು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬಹುದು, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಜಾಗೃತ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ 12 ಅಥವಾ 15 ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯೇ ಏನೋ; ಅದರ ಸಾಧ್ಯಾನಾಧ್ಯತೆ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

(Interruption)

ಹತ್ತೇ ಸಾಕೆಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಿತ್ರರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಸಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಸಾಕು. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದಸ್ಯರು ವರ್ಷವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಒದಗಿಸುವುದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕೆಲಸವೇ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಕೆಲವು ವೇಳೆ ರಿಕಾರ್ಡ್‌ಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಗೆಡ್ಡಲು ತಿಂದು ಹೋಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ, ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ ಊರಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಒಬ್ಬ ನೌಕರರು ಗೊಣಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದುದು ನನ್ನ ಕಿವಿಗೆ ಬಿದ್ದಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಹತ್ತು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಹತ್ತು ದಿವಸಗಳೊಳಗೇ ಉತ್ತರ ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈ ಸೇರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸಾಕು. ಶೀಘ್ರವಾಗಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿಯಂತ್ರ ರಸ್ತೆ ಹಿಡಿದಿರುವುದು, ಬಹಳ ತಾಮಸಮನೋಭಾವನೆ ಯಿರುವುದು. ಇದು ಹೋಗಬೇಕು.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಫಫೂಯೆನ್ಸ್ ಎಂದು ಕೆಲವು ಭಾಗ ಡಿಲೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಇದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮಗೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೇ, ಇಲ್ಲವೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇಫಫೂಯೆನ್ಸ್ ಅಗಿರುವ ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಡಿಲೇಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವವರಿಗೆ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆದು ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲನೇಷನ್ ಕೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯ, ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕು. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಮತ್ತೆ ಮಿಮರ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು, ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇವರಮೇಲೆ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನೂಟನೆ ನೂಟಿಸುವ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಬಂದು ಇನ್ನೂ ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷ ಸಹ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಇನ್ನೂ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಬೆಳೆದಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ನಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಗಲೇ ಈ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೊಂದು ಸಲ, ಮೂರು ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೊಂದು ಸಲ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗಬಹುದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವಶ್ಯಾನ ಸೂಚನೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವಂಥ ನಿಯಮವನ್ನು ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಡತದಿಂದ ಕಿತ್ತು ಹಾಕಬೇಕು. ಮದ್ರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಪ್ರಕಾಶಂ ಅವರ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲವಿದ್ದಾಗ ನಡೆದ ಪ್ರಕರಣವನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟು ಬೇಕು. ಇದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಐದು ವರ್ಷ ಸುಸೂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂಥ ಪ್ರಾವೀರ್ಯ ಇರಬಾರದು. ಇದ್ದರೆ ಯಾವ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಶ್ಯಾನ ಸೂಚನೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಎಂಬ ಶಂಕೆ ಇದ್ದೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಆಗ್ನೇಯಮೇಖ ಏನೂ ರಿವರ್ಸ್ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಯೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನ್‌ಪ್ರಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಫೈನಿಷ್ ಇದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—30 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು 20 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗೆ ಇಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಮೊದಲು ವಾದ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಈ No-confidence provision ಇರಲೇ ಕೂಡದು ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಇದರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಭಯ ಇದೆ. ಅದಕಾರಣ no-confidenceನ ಭಯ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಐದು ವರ್ಷದ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗಾದರೂ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರ, ಮನೆ, ಕಾರು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ನನ್ನ ಹಳೆಯ ಕಾರನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಗೇ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಹಳೆಯ ಕಾರಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಬಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನಗೆ ಗೊರವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ 40 ಜನ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇರುವುದೇ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲದಿರುವಾಗ ಅವಶ್ಯಾನ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಹೇಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದೀತು? ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು 20 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಎಂದು ಇರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಈ ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಬೆಳೆಯಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ದೊರೆಯುವುದು. ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ಮೊಟಕು ಆಗುವ ಭಯವಿದೆ. ಅದಕಾರಣ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಳದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಾನ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತರಲು 20 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಮತ್ತು ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಮೇಲೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಾನ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತರಲು 25 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಬೆಂಬಲವಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಳವೇ ಆಗಲಿ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಏತ ಕ್ಷೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸಭೆಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಪೀಚ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಒಂದು ಫೈನಿಷ್ ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕು ಅಥವಾ ಕನ್‌ವೆನ್ಷನ್ ಎನ್ನಬಲ್ಲದ್ದು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು

ವಿನಯಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಿಮಗೆ ರೂಲ್ ಇರಬೇಕೋ ಅಥವಾ ಕನ್‌ವೆನ್ಷನ್ ಬೇಕೋ? ಎರಡೂ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆಯಾಗಿವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ರೂಲ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸ್ಪೀಚ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ರೂಲ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is a rule. That is not a convention.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—In the absence of these two we are in a dilemma.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Minister who has resigned must come and make a statement?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—While making a statement he must have a dig against other Ministers! (Laughter)

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಳ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಾಗ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಪೀಚ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಈ ಸ್ಪೀಚ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುವುದೂ ಬೇಡ, ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಳವನ್ನು ಕಿತ್ತು ಹಾಕುವುದೂ ಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ತರದ ಹಿಡಿತವಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಇಲ್ಲದ ಕಿಠಾಪತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ 'a Minister who resigns must make a statement' ಎಂದು ಇರಬೇಕು.

ಇನ್ನು ಟೈಮ್ ರಿಸ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಷನ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಮಹತ್ವದ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವಾಗ, ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್, ಮನಿಬರ್ಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಭಾಷಣದಮೇಲೆ ಟೈಂ ಲಿಮಿಟ್ ಹಾಕುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಟೈಂ ಮುಗಿದ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಗಂಟೆ ಹೊಡೆದಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಚೀನ್ ಬ್ರೇಕ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಮಹತ್ವದ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಮರೆತುಹೋಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅದಕಾರಣ ಈ ಟೈಂ ಲಿಮಿಟ್ ಇರಕೂಡದು. ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಟೈಮ್ ಲಿಮಿಟ್ ಇರುವಾಗ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ರೂಢಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವುದು. ಎಲ್ಲ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಈ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯು ಇದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಟೈಮ್ ಲಿಮಿಟ್ ಹಾಕುವುದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ದೊರೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

295. Procedure when Speaker rises. ನಾವು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಡಿಸಿಪ್ಲಿನ್ ಸೋಲ್ವರ್ಸ್ ಹಾಗೆ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ತಾಳೂ ಸಹ ಅನೇಕ ಸಾರಿ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಆದೇರಾ ಪುಸ್ತಕದಲ್ಲಿದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಅಡಾಪ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಲೇ ಇರುತ್ತೇವೆ, ತಾವು ಗಂಟೆ ಹೊಡೆಯುತ್ತಲೇ ಇರುತ್ತೀರಿ. 'Whenever the Speaker rises he

shall be heard in silence and any member who is then speaking or offering to speak shall immediately sit down' ಎಂದು ಇದೆ. ನನಗಾದರೂ ಅನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ ಚೀರ್'ಗೆ ಗೌರವ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಮೊದಲನೆಯವನು. ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಸಾರಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆಕೆ ಚಿಜರಿ ಬೆಂಚ್‌ನವರೂ ಬೋಧನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಒಂದು ಏನಿದೆ ಅದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಸ್ಯಾಗತಾರ್ಹವಾದುದು, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೃತಜ್ಞರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೇಳಿ, ಇನ್ನೂ ಎರಡೆಲ್ಲ ಲೋಪದೋಷ ಇದೆ, ಆ ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಮಾಡಲು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತಂದು ಅವನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ಸುಸೂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಇದು ಬುನಾದಿಯಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮದರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರಿಗೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಬಾಂಧವ್ಯ ಏನು ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರೂಲ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದೂ ಮತ್ತು ಅದನ್ನು ಇತರ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳು ತರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದೂ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ರೂಲ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಸ್ಯಾಗತಾರ್ಹವಾದುದಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಎಲ್ಲ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಮೈಸೂರು ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ರೂಲ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ತಪ್ಪಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಒಂದು ಚರ್ಚಾ ಕೂಡ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಡದು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳ ಸುಖಾಂತರ ಇದನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. False prestige ಗೆ stick on ಆಗದೆ ಸೂಕ್ತ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಮಾಡಿ ತನ್ನ ಖಾಂತರ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*Sri B. SHAM SUNDER (Bhalki).—Sir, I am sorry to say that some of the members in the Committee did not protect us. That is why many of the members here are disgruntled. This shows that a majority of the members in the Committee have prevailed on the other members, or that the members in the Opposition kept quiet and did not say anything. That is why I say, instead of making rules, it is better we establish such conventions which should be conducive to our progress.

A few days back, I heard this in the Assembly: When an Hon'ble Member was asked to make a statement, he said that he was appointed by the Governor. I do not know who elected him to the House and how he was given a chance here. The House does not mean only the Opposition or the Treasury Bench,

but the full House. He has been appointed by the full House that he has to be the Leader of the House. A few days ago the same Hon'ble Member said that whatever the majority would decide, it would be followed by the people. Certainly not. That is not the convention. It is quite different. I do not know how any member can say thus.

Coming to the question of no-confidence motion mentioned in the rules, I wish to say that even the devil quotes the Bible when it suits his purpose. In the same way, the Lok Sabha rules have been quoted here. You will see the difference; when the question of no-confidence comes, we have to give notice of a motion to three gentlemen. That is adopted from the Lok Sabha Rules. But they do not adopt the rule of one-tenth and say something else. This should not be so. What is the use of making rules and not following them? I think raising the number of members for moving a no-confidence motion is not only dangerous to the democracy, is not only dangerous to the people and the country, but it is also dangerous to the party in power. You know that the Opposition members will have to go to other members to create a breach in the ruling camp. It has happened. There is nothing more to say, but only two things. We have to make a procedure, clean, clear and simple. We are not here to give notice to anybody. Notice to one person is sufficient. It is the duty of the office to give notice to all the members, and reduce the number of members to give notice of a no-confidence motion to as small as possible—I would say one-tenth or make it even one-twelfth. I do not know how Sri Muckannappa said that we did not require a no-confidence motion at all in the rules. It is provided in the Constitution itself. It has been provided there to set things right. In our House we have seen that when once a no-confidence motion was tabled there was lot of *gud bud*. Then the people came to their senses. Then they began to sail smoothly. Then in their camp some thing happened and they did change. We as the representatives of the people of this country want to know why that

(SRI B. SHAM SUNDER)

change took place. The gentleman in power who is called the Leader of the House is afraid to give a statement. I do not know why. Sir, these are the only two things. We have to give notice to only one person and we have to reduce the number of members required to give a no-confidence motion.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Sir, I am advocating to scrap these rules. Scrap it. . . .

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—As we have not adopted them as yet, where is the question of scrapping.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—We are on the process of adopting.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Instead of using the word 'scrapping,' it is much better to say that we should not adopt. Scrapping comes only after adopting.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The word used is scrapping, Sir. The Hon'ble Speaker used the word scrapping. Scrapping is improving. Scrapping is dropping.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I meant scrapping.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Sri Puttaswamy envisages a position as if the rules have been adopted. We are still in the process of considering the Report. When once the rules are scrapped, the question of adoption does not at all arise. My position is this. It is hardly necessary for me to bring to your notice how very important it is if one were to help the people. What is it that we are doing to voice our opinion in this House in as free a manner as possible?

5 P.M.

The hope with which we propound certain policies is to carry them out. Somehow, why I say that we should scrap this is for this reason. The Committee, with due respect to every one of its members, have only thought of visualising a particular aspect of things without giving this august House the right to implement its policy and exercise its rights. Sir, I am reading page 42 of the May's Parliamentary Practice. It is said therein that what the members enjoy here is privilege *plus* contempt. Breach of privilege and contempt. Privilege is not contempt

and contempt is not privilege. What the Rules Committee has adumbrated is only privilege, not a word about contempt. I will just read:

"...When any of these rights and immunities both of the members individually and of the Assembly in its collective capacity which are known by the general name of privileges, are disregarded or attacked by any individual or authority, the offence is called breach of privilege and is punishable under the law. Each House also claims....."

This is what is important and what is omitted in our Rules:

"...Each House also claims the right to punish actions which will end in breach of any privilege or offence against the authority or dignity such as disobedience of its legitimate commands or libel upon its officers or its members. Such actions, though often called breach of privileges, are more properly distinguished as contempt."

It goes on further:

"...Privileges of the Legislative Assembly would be entirely ineffectual....."

I would like you to mark the words:

"*would be entirely ineffectual* to discharge its functions if it had no power to punish offenders, to impose disciplinary regulations upon its members or to enforce obedience to its commands."

Therefore, Sir, I am very surprised that all the distinguished members who sat in this Committee to frame these Rules, have forgotten that one word "CONTEMPT". I am reading Rule 177: Questions of Privilege—not a word about CONTEMPT. Contempt is something more than privilege. I would like to put it that way. If I have not got the right of vindicating or putting through any of the ideas that I am going to speak here, I better not be here as well and waste my time and waste the money of the exchequer of the State. So that, some

officer, some authority whom I have in my control, if he does not execute certain things, if I have no power to control him and to punish him, what am I here for? Therefore, I would like the Hon'ble Minister to kindly think over.....

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Please say 'Member in Charge'.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Whatever that is, you are an august Member of this House. Please remember the duties cast on you.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—With due respect to my learned friend, I could not follow what he wants me to adopt in the Rules.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In this case, I would like to refer the Hon'ble Member to the provisions in the Constitution. The Constitution says that the privileges enjoyed by the House of Commons are the privileges of both Houses of Indian Parliament as well as the State Legislatures. So long as we have not defined what is meant by privileges and contempt, we enjoy all the rights which are enjoyed by the House of Commons. I would like to give a piece of information. In Bombay we tried to define 'privilege'—what is privilege and what is contempt. We came across such a vast amount of difficulty that it was not possible to proceed further. That does not mean that the Rules of Procedure take away the power which we have about the breach of privilege and contempt.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I am highly grateful to the Speaker, Sir.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—On a point of clarification. Is not the law different regarding the contempt committed in England from that in India?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Contempt of course may differ from place to place. That is why I said we have to look into certain circumstances. It cannot be defined as such. If any case arises, we have to look into it and see whether it can *prima facie* be a case of contempt.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—By implication of the Constitutional provision referred to by the Chair just now, is it that we deem that whatever

is deemed to be contempt in Parliament in U. K. is contempt necessarily in India?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not referring to the contempt or breach of privilege. I only said that we enjoy the same rights as the House of Commons.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I have got here with me the Rules of the Madras Assembly and also of the West Bengal Assembly. Nowhere it is said that privilege is unqualified contempt. My respectful submission is privilege is distinct from contempt. It is something altogether different. We cannot tag on one with the other.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Is it not ordinarily true that a case of contempt involves a breach of privilege?

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—No. One is different from the other.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You just now read, from the May's Parliamentary Procedure that breach of privilege of the House is more precisely contempt. Breach of privilege is genus whereas, contempt is species. Though we have not put it in the Rules of Procedure, we do not lose our right which we have so far as the breach of privilege and contempt are concerned, because the power is synonymous with the powers of the House of Commons.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—In fact, what is contemplated is: we have thought that privilege is comprehensive and contempt is also included in it. It is just to ward off this misapprehension that it is made more distinct. Let there be no misapprehension any further.

If you are not going to define contempt, how powerless will be this House! The Constitution contemplates that this House should be supreme and all-powerful. Consider what we are doing by incorporation of such a rule. It is as if we are trying to put some imposition or restraint on ourselves. I dare say that privilege is something different from contempt. By incorporating this rule, my apprehension is that we are not making ourselves a body as supreme as we ought to be. Privilege and contempt must be defined clearly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If contempt is species, breach of privilege is the genus. Of course, it is covered by the Rules.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—It is not so simple that we can leave it at that.

There is also another aspect. One is laying down the policy and the other is the functional aspect. What exactly are you going to do and what is the weapon with which you can do it? That is absent. Breach of privilege does not include contempt. If you are not going to incorporate the word 'contempt' everything will be ineffectual. I can read out decision after decision to show that one is distinctly marked out from the other and that there is no question of overlapping. I would, therefore, like it to be defined somewhere in the Rules. Here, we are taking away unconsciously a potent weapon which we had. Of course, we are not doing it deliberately. With your eyes wide open, think over this matter and do the right thing.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Is there any reference to the word 'contempt' in the Constitution?

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—You have deviated from the procedure that has been adopted by the Parliament. Have you not got the individuality to rise above everybody in the world?

Mr. SPEAKER.—This House cannot in any way punish contempt of any sort. It can only punish contempt which involves a breach of privilege. So, contempt must necessarily be a breach of privilege to allow this House to take notice of it. I want the Hon'ble Member to take note of this distinction.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—The distinction is simple. Here is Sri Mallaradhyia trying to flout the authority of this august House?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Never. Let him not dream about it.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—And suppose a question of breach of privilege is raised. There is an authority to execute certain things of this House. That authority is different from the member who wants to defy an order of this House or to bring down

the respect of this House. In this connection, I want to read again what I have already read from May's Parliamentary Practice.

"When any of these rights and immunities both of the members individually and of the Assembly in its collective capacity which are known by the general name of privileges are disregarded or attacked by any individual or authority, the offence is called breach of privilege and is punishable under the law. Each House also claims the right to punish actions which will end in breach of any privilege or offence against the authority or dignity such as disobedience of its legitimate commands or libel upon its officers or its members. Such actions, though often called breach of privileges, are more properly distinguished as contempt. The privileges of the Legislative Assembly would be entirely ineffectual to discharge its functions if it had no power to punish offenders, to impose disciplinary regulations upon its members or to enforce obedience to its commands."

Therefore, my only submission is that there is a distinction and that we must bear it in mind.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is a very important issue raised by my friend Sri Deenadayalu Naidu. Who are the people who will possibly offer any contempt to this House in the execution of an order or directive? Beyond the executive I do not think we have anybody else in view. If any member of this House commits anything which comes within the breach of privilege it is open to a member to say that such and such a member has committed a breach of privilege. But if he has anybody outside the House in view I do not think we have any power at all.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Whenever a privilege of this House or the privilege of a member of this House is infringed on account of certain thing done either by somebody in the House or elsewhere outside the House, there arises a question of privilege and we have power

in dealing with it. I do not want to concede the difference that the Hon'ble Member Sri Deenadayalu Naidu tries to make between a breach of privilege and contempt. The question of contempt arises when there is infringement of the rights or privileges that are vested in the members of this august body.

SRI V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Let the Hon'ble Minister understand that by authority he cannot bring in a point here and say let all the 208 Hon'ble Members decide; it will not be possible to decide.

MR. SPEAKER.—Unfortunately my friend Sri Kadidal Manjappa is here in a double capacity; he is the mover of the motion for consideration of the Report and he also happens to be Revenue Minister. If the Hon'ble Member Sri Deenadayalu Naidu says that the Hon'ble Minister or the 208 members of this House cannot win a point in the face of the law being against them that would be casting a sort of reflection on the House. That would mean we are making some rules or laws which are against the Constitution itself. We are not attempting any such things. I shall read to the Hon'ble Member a portion of article 194 of the Constitution:

“(3) In other respects, the powers, privileges and immunities of a House of the Legislature of a State, and of the members and the committees of a House of such Legislature, shall be such as may from time to time be defined by the Legislature by law, and, until so defined, shall be those of the House of Commons of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and of its members and committees, at the commencement of this Constitution.”

Now it is quite clear that we have not so far defined the powers, privileges and immunities, of the House. We are governed by clause (3) of article 194 which means that we follow the House of Commons so far as the powers, privileges and immunities of a House of Legislature of a State are concerned. There should be no difficulty then because, as I have also explained,

contempt must involve a breach of privilege before we can take action against anybody. There are rules of procedure if it involves breach of privilege.

SRI V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I am highly indebted to you for reading the Constitution. We are at the point of defining certain things and this is the appropriate time for the House to take cognizance of these things.

MR. SPEAKER.—We are not defining these matters by law. This is not the occasion. This is only for adopting the Rules of Procedure. As I have just now explained, the question of privilege and contempt is not so simple a thing. It covers a lot of case law. There is nothing definite about it because our ideas of privilege and contempt differ from time to time. That is why it has been kept as it is. Even in England a breach of privilege has not been defined. Certain matters which were taken as breach of privilege have now been doubted as to whether they should be taken as breach of privilege because of new situations arising. Some member of the House of Commons wrote to his constituency to tell him if they had any difficulties. Some persons belonging to his constituency wrote to him about certain matters in which was involved some contempt of the House. That was forwarded by the member to the Parliament with a covering letter. Even to-day—his is a burning question in the House of Commons whether this is an act of breach of privilege or not. Certain ideas change with the result that we have to adapt ourselves to those ideas. It is much better that we do not attempt to define what is a breach of privilege.

SRI V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Then we are left with this: we are trying to curtail our powers in the way that I am putting. We will have to look back for certain definitions or clarifications to the House of Commons. What is it they have done? They have not defined but there is a distinction between a breach of privilege and contempt. We also remember how in the erstwhile Mysore State they launched a case against an Editor for certain attacks against Legislative Proceedings and action was

(SRI V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU)

5-30 P.M.

taken against him. All that is clearly and vividly before me. That is a different atmosphere but in spite of it we are going on with the same procedure. We have got a Constitution and even under the Constitution it is not defined. I feel this is the appropriate occasion when we must try to draw a distinction between a breach of privilege and contempt. We must make it clear as to what is a breach of privilege and whether it includes contempt. Otherwise we will be leaving a lacuna. We are now defining the privilege and prestige of this House and therefore I am only anxious that we should not leave it without being defined. That is the first point I would like to urge.

The second point is: I have noticed with dismay and regret I was expecting some sort of an answer from the Minister which he never tried.....

An HON'BLE MEMBER.—On what point?

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Do not be in a hurry. With regard to language question what is it that you have done?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Constitution is there.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I know. After fifteen years from the commencement of this Constitution the words "or in English" must be deleted—that is what the Constitution says. I shall read article 210(2):

"Unless the Legislature of the State by law otherwise provides, this article shall, after the expiration of a period of fifteen years from the commencement of this Constitution, have effect as if the words "or in English" were omitted therefrom."

We have already passed through ten years and we have only three or four years before us and then automatically it ceases. In about three or four years, if we do not make a proper amendment to the Constitution, the word English will be done away with, without this House knowing it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We need not be afraid of it.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I am not afraid. I am not afraid at all of anybody, or of any Minister. What is it that we are doing now? You are very conversant with the Bombay rules. What is stated in Bombay rules? Let me read it. It is rule 21 of the Bombay Legislative Rules. Have they not been courageous and bold to define what their language is? Why is it we are shirking behind? Why is it we want to be silent?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I must correct you. They never defined 'official language'. The difficulty in Bombay is: They have Hindi, Marathi, Gujarathi and Kannada. If they were to attempt to define any one of them as the official language it will be very difficult. Therefore in Bombay, Hon'ble Members may make speeches either in the regional language, Hindi, or Gujarathi or Marathi or Kannada or in English or in their mother-tongue.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Why not take appropriate action to amend the Constitution so as to extend English for another twenty years?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If English is the mother-tongue of the person, he can talk in English for all time.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Bombay rule 21 reads:

"The business of the Assembly shall be transacted in the official language or languages of the State or in Hindi or in English:

Provided that until the official language or languages of the State are determined by law, any member may address the Assembly in any of the recognised languages:

Provided further that the Speaker may permit any member who cannot adequately express himself in any of the languages aforesaid, to address the Assembly in his mother-tongue."

Mr. SPEAKER.—This is what I am saying. In fact in Bombay, they speak in six languages.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—That is one thing.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The last proviso is very important.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes. They state that you can speak in any other regional language, in Hindi or in your mother-tongue.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Provided the Speaker will not misunderstand me, I would say that we will be at the mercy of the Speaker. I would like to speak in my mother-tongue. The Speaker may allow the member to speak in that language. But if it is the wish and the pleasure of the Speaker not to allow, then I am at the mercy of the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We have not defined any language in which a member should speak. You can speak in your mother-tongue.

An HON'BLE MEMBER.—That is the accepted rule.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Where is the accepted rule?

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Hon'ble Member has observed the proceedings of the House, he will see that it has been my practice to allow a speaker to talk in any language he likes. I have made it quite clear. That is prevailing everywhere.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—It must change from tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no question of change. Any person may begin his speech in any language he likes. But he should not change his language in the middle of his speech or during the speech. Nobody need be at the mercy of the Speaker. If anybody thinks so, I am sure such a thing exists in the imagination of the member. I have made it clear. I have committed myself to the position that any Hon'ble Member may speak in any language he likes. Even in Parliament any member can speak in any language he likes. Some Hon'ble Members speak in Telugu and some in Tamil.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—That is the generosity we enjoy.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no generosity. That is the convention.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That is the privilege we enjoy.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Article 210 is clear. I do not know why we should quarrel over this matter.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—That is what we enjoy under Speaker Sri Kanthi. But I do not know whether we can enjoy for all times.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not talking about myself.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—In West Bengal Legislature, Rule 9 reads as follows :

“The business of the Assembly shall be transacted in English, provided that any Member may address the Assembly in Bengali or Hindusthani and that the Speaker may permit a member unacquainted or not sufficiently acquainted with English or Bengali or Hindusthani, to address the Assembly in any other Indian language.”

That is also an omnibus clause. But it gets affected by Section 210 of the Constitution sub-clause (2) where the word ‘English’ is going to be wiped out even without that coming to our notice. Therefore we will have to convey our views to the Parliament that it should extend the life of English language. This is a proper occasion to convey our views. In section 210, it is stated that after the expiration of a period of 15 years from the commencement of the Constitution it “have effect as if the words ‘or in English’ were omitted therefrom.” I say amend the Constitution. But how will they do it unless you speak out? You are the representatives of the people. You take the occasion and say extend the life of English language for another 20 years.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—How can that be the subject of Rules Committee? The Assembly can pass a resolution. If Sri Deenadayalu Naidu wants, he can give notice of a motion—a non-official resolution.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—It is there and it will come about. I am only just putting it earlier. I am afraid I may be sleeping over it here, and I may be missing it. But for the present here is an occasion. Let us wake up. Our representatives at the Centre may be sleeping. But here is an occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So far as I have been able to smell, there is no such bad smell at all. You need not be afraid that English will go.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I am conscious as well as every member here of the controversy that is raging. Please do not minimise the importance of this point. Whatever be our likes and dislikes, English, we will have to use for some more time, whatever the constitutional provision. To that end, what is it that we are doing? The rules that we are framing will bind us.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—May I ask one question? May I know whether the Rules framed should be in conformity with the Constitutional provision?

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Otherwise your Rules will be *ultra vires*. If it is not in consonance with the Constitution, it will be a scrap of paper. What is it that you are going to tell me Sri Kadidal Manjappa! (*Laughter*) On this point and on points of constitutional law personalities should be wiped out. (*Laughter*)

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Completely!

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—We must think of something sublime and supreme. I am only anxious about the rights and privileges of this House. I am not bothered about the May's Parliamentary procedure. What is my right? and what is my language? Tomorrow the Speaker may allow a particular member to speak in a language or not. I want that thing to be definite. It must find a place in the Rules in consonance with the Constitution, as Sri Kadidal Manjappa wants it. Very good. I want him to definitely remove this confusion regarding the question of languages. Otherwise, I will hold him squarely, as long as he lives! (*Laughter*)

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I am thankful. At least he will remember me!

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—The third point is about Questions. Tomorrow the very first question stands in my name. Just as the Government lays certain papers on the Table, has the private member got a right to place anything that is real and true on the Table to contradict the Minister? Why I am saying that is, tomorrow my very first question is something about which I must doubt myself,—whether I am living or not! I have been responsible for a report as Mayor. There was a Government Order constituting a committee—the Chief Engineer, the Electrical Chief Engineer, etc. The report was submitted to the Government. I have raised a question about the water supply and have asked about the committee constituted to consider this point. The question is:

“Was there a committee constituted by the Government?”

“No” is the reply furnished.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like to know whether that question was taken up today?

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—It has been answered and printed, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Of course, I can understand that some such question is there. I said so in the morning. But we have not been able to take it up. Any reply to that question could be quoted before this House if the question had been taken up.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Sir, on principle, a member knows that something is real and it is a fact. I want the guidance of the Chair in this matter. If some Head of the Department misleads the Government, here we are possessed with the information which is true and correct. How am I to place it before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I tell you a remedy. You can come to me and place the record before me. I will look into the record and if the record convinces me that the reply given by the Government is not correct, I will ask the Government to make a statement making necessary corrections.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Sir, with great reluctance I say that it is not always possible—let alone necessary—to keep on pestering the Chairman or the Speaker in his chambers and telling that what the Government has done is wrong or right.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is part of democracy. You cannot help it.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Somehow, it gets on my nerves,—waiting on the convenience of others. I am here; if the Speaker is pleased to give an opportunity, I will speak for whatever period that is at my command. Otherwise, with very great respect, I am not prepared to wait at the Speaker's door or at the Minister's door. Never will I do it. I take it that it is the duty of others to do so.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is nothing compulsory about it.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Why should I wait? I find that an information given by the Government is wrong and I have the records to prove that it is wrong. When I say it is wrong, I take the responsibility for it. Where is the opportunity for me to state that what the Government has said is incorrect?

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all, it has been a convention. The convention that has been followed is that when a member feels that the reply given by the Hon'ble Minister is wrong, he has a course open to him. That course is that he has to approach the Speaker, convince him that the reply is quite wrong and the Speaker will call the Minister and have a talk with him, convince him that the reply is not correct and ask him to correct it by an open statement in the House.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—There is an opportunity to raise a half-hour debate on the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Apart from this, I can give an opportunity to the Hon'ble Minister to correct his statement in the House by making a statement.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—If supposing it is not the Government. Take the case of a private member who makes a wrong statement in the House.

After all the member is also required to take responsibility in relation to the statement made by him. Supposing a member makes some wrong statement and makes a statement which very nearly borders on libel or slander, would he not be also held responsible for the statement and should not a similar rule be there? If the Government with all its official machinery sometimes is prone to commit a mistake in the collection of its information, then with what conscience can you insist that a private member should take responsibility for the correctness of the statement he is making?

Mr. SPEAKER.—A member making a wrong statement is one thing and the Government making a wrong statement is another. Government making a wrong statement is more serious. That is why I have always said that if any member makes a wrong statement, he must correct himself. I will always give an opportunity to the member or Minister to correct himself on the floor of the House. After all, in this case, Hon'ble Members will also remember that the Ministers give replies on the notes and answers furnished by the Departments. The mistake may lie there. After all, it is impossible for the Minister to know everything. He gets information from the Department and that Department might have given him wrong information. He will try to correct himself by making a statement. But before I take a step in that direction, I would like to request the member concerned to convince me that the reply is wrong. Otherwise, it would be impossible for me to take any step to have it corrected. Any reply given by the Government must be presumed to be correct. The Treasury Benches are not only responsible but also responsive.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I hope you will, Sir, give a correct guidance in this behalf. I have been at pains to know from various other neighbouring Assemblies as to how best a private member can place certain genuine information before the Government so that they may not err. In this connection, the Chair has been

(SRI V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU)

pointing out that the member concerned may go to his chamber and so on. Whether that would meet the requirements of the members is a different matter.

Sir, I have taken much time of the House and I come to my last point which is a revolutionary point. That is about 'point of order'. The suggestion is that just as a motion of no-confidence can be raised by 20 members, provision should be made to bring a decided point of order by way of a motion if 20 people signify their consent to it. This motion may be discussed just like a point raised for half an hour discussion. The idea is not to question the ruling of the Chair. What happens is that, when the Speaker gives a ruling on the spur of the moment, being a human being after all, he is bound to err. The Speaker does not reserve the decision on every point of order. Supposing the Speaker gives a decision on a point of order on the spur of the moment which does not satisfy some members, pandemonium may prevail and he will have to restore order. A discussion may be sought to be raised on certain matters of policy and then the Chair may apply certain veto. This suggestion may look odd and some members may ask why I am trying to flout the ruling of the Chair. That is far from my intention. I do not mean to cast reflection whatsoever on the Chair. Democracy can exist on two things, namely, discipline and respect for majority decision. For the moment, I bow down to the decision of the Speaker and if after due reconsideration I feel the decision is not correct, I should have an opportunity to reopen the decision on that ruling by way of a motion. If a group of 20 responsible people convince that the decision is not correct, why not we correct ourselves and thereby put democracy on a sound foundation?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—That is done in local bodies.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Yes. If there is anything wrong we say it is wrong and we correct ourselves. After all, a ruling once given

in this august House stands for all time to come and I hope it is the practice to have the rulings printed in a separate volume.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rulings of Speakers in the erstwhile Mysore State are printed and we are also taking steps to print the rulings.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—My respectful submission is that it may look very odd in the beginning, but I anticipate the position a century ahead when we are bound to have rulings which would be followed by the generations that are to come and which would never be questioned. If we have such rulings to follow, we will save the time of the House and it will not give room for members to raise any number of questions. We should do it in the interest of expeditious disposal of business of the House and of proper understanding of matters. Nothing is lost if a ruling is brought for discussion, for proper appreciation and for proper correction. After all, a ruling cannot be sustained for all time to come. Even the Constitution gets changed. So, what of the rulings?

Mr. SPEAKER.—May I know whether such a procedure should be followed in this House only; or whether we should make a recommendation in this behalf to other State Assemblies?

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—If the House feels it correct, it may adopt it; otherwise, it may throw it out.

6 P.M.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Will my friend give the experience of another Assembly where this procedure is contemplated?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think the Hon'ble Member Sri Deenadayalu Naidu takes some more time!

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Ten or fifteen minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will rise now. Before we rise I would like to make one statement. Tomorrow all the readings will have to be finished and the Rules of Procedure should be adopted.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—By the way in which speeches are being made,

I think it is better one more day is given because a number of members are willing to express themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think we can finish it tomorrow. Amendments are not many.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—These Rules were before the House for a considerable length of time and considered at length.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Considered and considered.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Yes, considered and considered. I believe we can finalise the whole thing tomorrow.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Rules will not be adopted today alone. By extending it by a day Government will not be put into any difficulty.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—Rules are meant for the House and not for the administration. I think Government will be graceful to extend it by one more day.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—After seeing the number of members ready to participate in the discussion we can decide it tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will decide tomorrow. In fact I wanted non-official resolutions to be taken up on Monday and Tuesday. But in view of the uncertainty that is prevailing now we will think of it tomorrow.

*Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I want to know the point of view of the Government regarding questions. My friend Sri Mallaradhya at the outset suggested that we may *in toto* adopt the Lok Sabha procedure relating to questions. That is the only point which is very important. I am told that the Committee considered this question and for some good reason chose this procedure. I am told that there is some difficulty in adopting the Lok Sabha practice. If the Minister in charge of these draft rules is able to tell us what is the special difficulty, it may help us to make up our mind. As far as I am concerned, I have to congratulate the Committee on its Report. But I also prefer the Lok Sabha practice with respect to questions. When the Hon'ble Minister moved for the consideration of these Rules, he did not tell us why the Committee did not choose to

follow the Lok Sabha practice. If he can say that, it may help our discussion tomorrow.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Tomorrow I will explain the difficulties. Even today while moving for consideration of these Rules, I explained any number of difficulties that the members are experiencing on account of the practice now in vogue in the Legislature.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Not about the present practice.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Even about that, the Minister will reply tomorrow at the end. So far as I have been able to make out, we have adopted the Lok Sabha practice in regard to questions though some innovations have been made. They have given 15 days' time for Government to reply, which means we have adopted Lok Sabha Procedure except in cases where Government are not in a position to give replies within 15 days they may ask for extension of time.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—According to the practice obtaining in Lok Sabha a member can expect answers for not more than three questions from a particular Minister on a particular day. But he is given the right to send questions even during the sittings of the Lok Sabha. That is a valuable right. There may be some difficulty for the Government to get answers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This procedure was adopted by the Committee so that all the questions may be thoroughly thrashed out. The procedure that is now prevailing in the Lok Sabha of not more than three questions of a member being answered in a day is not prevailing in any Assembly and secondly giving of a date by a member on which Government has to reply has not been accepted by any Assembly whatsoever because there are certain fundamental difficulties in this respect. In Lok Sabha they deal with problems of a national character and get information as quickly as possible.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Information is furnished by local Governments.

Mr. SPEAKER.—But information can be easily had. Here supposing an event occurs in a far off place like Bagalkot where recently Hindu-Muslim disturbance took place; it is impossible to get information either by telephone or telegraph; the same thing with regard to Bidar district where satyagraha is going on.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Even within ten days?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not possible. If you want I shall adopt that procedure. But I am uncertain of it. I am anxious that a member should get information for the question he gives notice. Even from the member's point of view it is not advisable to adopt the procedure that is in vogue in Lok Sabha. There is another thing. So far as questions are concerned, as soon as we receive them we have to get them translated and send them for printing. That means four days. In Parliament there is no procedure of this kind at all. They will get questions in English. That is why we want 15 days. I assure the members that they will get replies within 15 days and in very few cases time will be extended. Regarding the other point concerned referred to by Sri Mallaradhy, viz. the member dictating to the Minister about the time when he should reply, this has not been accepted by any Assembly.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, I was submitting to the House through you my preference to the Lok Sabha practice. I just want to know—not that I was finding fault with the Committee for adopting a different procedure, and even now I believe that the Committee have adopted this procedure for very good reasons—what are the difficulties in the way of Government not adopting the Lok Sabha procedure. I am told that in Lok Sabha, for every question, nearly two hundred rupees are spent. Is that a fact? If that is so, it is a point for this House to consider whether we can spend a like sum in getting answers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That aspect of the question is very important. It is a fact that Parliament on an average spends about two to three hundred rupees on a question.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Are similar figures available for Mysore?

Mr. SPEAKER.—In Mysore, it is ten to fifteen rupees roughly.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Sometimes, it is 25 rupees. Supposing we make the time shorter, the expenditure will be more.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Mr. Speaker was pleased to say that if we adopted the Lok Sabha procedure, it would be inconvenient to get information from the integrated areas, rather, that it would not be possible to get information readily from those areas. Ten days time may not be sufficient. I want information from the Government on the doubts that I entertain so that we may participate in the discussion in a more useful manner. I never wanted to take the time of the House, nor did I choose this occasion to make a speech.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I will give the necessary explanation tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The necessary explanation will be given tomorrow. So far as I have understood, the cost of getting replies to a question was also one of the points considered by the special Committee. Erstwhile Mysore is more developed from the communications' point of view but the integrated parts are not so developed. That point was also taken into consideration. That is why we had to adopt the Lok Sabha procedure with certain modifications. However, the Hon'ble Minister will make the explanations tomorrow.

The House will now rise and meet tomorrow at 8-30 A.M.

The House adjourned at Fifteen Minutes past Six of the Clock to meet again at Thirty Minutes past eight of the Clock on Saturday, the 15th November 1958.
